

Sinclair Broadcasting's actions in October 2004 demonstrate that we need to re-establish the Fairness Doctrine.

I'm a "swing voter," and I know that I'm getting news from a balanced source when there is some news coverage with a slant that I agree with, and some that I disagree with. National Public Radio is a good model of balanced coverage.

In contrast, large media corporations like Fox and Sinclair have a pattern of injecting editorial comment into news coverage, to an extent that shows a clear agenda.

I would have no problem with Sinclair showing "Stolen Honor" (an anti-Kerry piece) if Sinclair also showed "Fahrenheit 9/11" (an anti-Bush piece). Both of these films would need to be shown in the same time slot, on two successive weekday evenings.

If Sinclair shows just one of these films, and ignores the other, then they are guilty of blatant bias, and are promulgating propaganda on the publicly-owned RF spectrum

Sinclair recently attempted to pave the way for "Stolen Honor" by having their affiliates run an editorial (Sunday 17 Oct 2004) by Mark Hyman (a Sinclair V.P.) on how "liberal" the news media is, and why there needs to be some balance.

Mr Hyman's comments should be perceived in light of Sinclair's firing of one of their news staff managers, on account of this manager protesting that "Stolen Honor" amounts to a campaign ad for Bush-Cheney.

It should be patently obvious that large media outlets are no more liberal than the corporations that own them.

When I make a contribution to a candidate's election fund, I need to declare that the funds come out of my own pocket. The same "independent financing" standards should apply to "in-kind" campaign contributions like airing "Stolen Honor."

In the case of Sinclair and "Stolen Honor," the funds come out of Sinclair Broadcasting's dividends to shareholders.

To summarize: We need to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine in broadcasting.

Thank you.